

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/811,249 | 03/26/2004 | Christopher J. Clements | 25307A | 1641 | |
| 22889 | 7590 09/22/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| OWENS CORNING 2790 COLUMBUS ROAD | | | WOLLSCHLAGER, JEFFREY MICHAEL | | |
| | C, OH 43023 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1732 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Advisory Action | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--------|-------|--------|-------|--|
| Before | the | Filing | of an | Appeal | Brief | |

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 10/811,249 | CLEMENTS, CHRISTOPHER J. | | |
| Examiner TW | Art Unit | | |
| Jeff Wollschlager | 1732 | | |

| | Jeff Wollschlager | 1732 | |
|--|---|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS | | • | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in one with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply missions | Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C | nce, which FR 41.31; or (3) |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70) | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 106.07(f). | g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F | on. ILED WITHIN |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi | ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of th | ns of the date of e appeal. Since |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to a proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection filed after a filed after a | nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re | TE below); | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (| (PTOL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) if how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none. Claim(s) objected to: none. Claim(s) rejected: 1-16. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | II be entered and an e | explanation of |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav | otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is | t be entered s necessary and |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. S | al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(| ls to provide a 1). |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu | t does NOT place the application in | n condition for allowar | nce because: |
| See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 1 wherein the preform is non-biodegradable raises the issue of new matter. The amendments to independent claims 1 and 11 include limitations that require further search and/or consideration. The proposed claim 1 limitations wherein the sugar comprises approximately 2-10% by weight, of preform; and wherein said sugar being fed into said preform mold prior to said feeding of said glass fibers into said preform mold; and forming a non-biodegradable preform have not been considered. The proposed claim 11 limitiations wherein the encapsulated shell of glass fibers bound by said binder, said bonded glass fibers surrounding internal glass fibers not bonded by said binder and wherein said binder is present on an external surface of said preform and wherein said fibers not bonded by said binder are internal with respect to the encapsulating shell have not been considered. The proposed amendment to dependent claim 13 wherein cooling said preform mold to bind sugar-coated glass fibers together and form said encapsulating shell of said preform has not been considered.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the reasons set forth in the final office action. It is noted that applicant's arguments are directed to the claims as amended, which have not been entered.

2